

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
FEBRUARY 25, 2025

Chair Kubow called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Jonathan Kubow, Chair
Ted Eckhardt
Kirsten Kingsley
John Fitzgerald

Members Absent: Scott Seyer

Also Present: J. Anstadt, J. Anstadt Architecture for 801 N. Forrest Ave.
John Kramer, AH Park District for *Recreation Park*
Maryfran Leno, President, AH Park District Board of Commissioners
Maggie Krieger, FGM Architects for *Recreation Park*
John Dzarnowski, FGM Architects for *Recreation Park*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JANUARY 28, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 28, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 11, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 11, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Due the expected length of discussion for the Recreation Park project tonight, it was suggested by Chairman Kubow that the 801 N. Forrest Avenue be reviewed first.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO REVERSE THE ORDER OF REVIEW FOR THE TWO ITEMS ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW**DC# 25-005 – 801 N. Forrest Ave.**

John Anstadt, representing *J. Anstadt Architecture*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a first-floor rear addition as well as a new second-floor addition to an existing single-story house. The existing attached 2-1/2 car garage will remain. The project does comply with all of the R-E single-family zoning requirements. The existing house received Design Commission approval in July 2022, and in 2023, the Design Commission selected the completed house to receive the annual Alan F. Bombick Award for Excellence in Design.

At this time, the petitioner is proposing to add a 1,659 sf Media/Exercise Room addition to the rear of the house, as well as 5-bedrooms and 3-bathrooms to the second floor. The second-floor addition is mostly set within the existing attic space, with new dormer windows on the front and rear, and it does not add any height to the house. The first-floor rear addition is a relatively large rectangular mass, which the Design Commission should evaluate along the north elevation. All of the materials and details have been selected to match the existing house.

Overall, Staff does not object to the design of the proposed additions. However, landscaping along the north wall of the new Media/Exercise Room is recommended to soften the appearance from the adjacent property. With this comment, Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Anstadt said that landscaping is intended, especially on the north side, which is a fairly large facade. The massing of the addition follows along the same forms of the existing home; it is a larger structure, but it mimics the existing garage on the side. They are tying the addition together by using the same materials.

Chair Kubow asked if there was any public comment on this project, and there was no response from those in the audience.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Kingsley** was in favor of the proposed addition, and she liked the materials. It is a big addition on the back of the home, but it meets all zoning requirements, and she especially liked how the east elevation fits in with the rest of the home, as well as the south elevation. She was disappointed that the second-floor addition did not incorporate some of the elements from the rest of the house on the new second floor, although she understood the addition is trying to fit within the existing space. She suggested shed roof dormers in lieu of the proposed hipped dormers for the second-floor addition, to match the rest of the house that has shed roofs and steep gables.

Mr. Anstadt said they initially looked at both a shed roof and a gable roof, with their goal being to minimize the main structure of the home. They concluded that shed roofs would be problematic in how low of a pitch would need to be done to make those work. **Commissioner Kingsley** stated that when looking at the composition of the front and the rear, the difference is noticed, and **Mr. Anstadt** agreed. **Commissioner Kingsley** also asked about lowering the edge to achieve a steeper pitch, and **Mr. Anstadt** said that could be done, although the ceiling height in those rooms is already only 8-feet. He said that overall, they felt this was the better way to address those conditions.

Commissioner Kingsley said the homeowners might want to think about this. The existing home is nicely done and fits really well together, but the second-floor addition will look like an addition. She liked the first-floor addition.

Commissioner Eckhardt liked the proposed design and the efforts to use the existing materials; the lot is big enough to handle the addition. With regards to the dormers on the back of the home, he liked the twin, hipped gable ends being proposed; a big shed roof would be too shallow and look more like an addition than what is currently proposed. He liked the detailing and that they match each other and have good balance. He supports the project as shown, and **Commissioner Fitzgerald** agreed.

Chair Kubow also agreed and said this is still the best home he has reviewed, it is his favorite. The proposed addition is a little challenging with what is trying to be accomplished, especially with the second-floor addition, but overall he felt the execution was fine.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 801 N. FORREST AVENUE, AS SUBMITTED. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS RECEIVED 1/21/25, EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS AND ROOF PLAN RECEIVED 2/18/25, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.**
- 2. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.**

**KINGSLEY, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; KUBOW, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

ITEM 2. PUBLIC LAND RE-REVIEW**DC#24-101 – Arlington Heights Park District - Recreation Park Bathhouse & Community Building – 500 E. Miner St.**

Maggie Krieger & John Dzarnowski, representing *FGM Architects*, **John Kramer**, representing the *Arlington Heights Park District*, and **Maryfran Leno**, President of the *Park District Board*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger The Arlington Heights Park District is seeking approval of the architectural design for a new Bathhouse building and an addition to the existing Community Building at Recreation Park. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval to amend the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD), and the Design Commission review is limited to the building design and signage. Only the architectural design for the building will be discussed tonight, and any concerns, comments, or questions about the site planning or zoning will be discussed at the upcoming Plan Commission hearing that has not yet been scheduled, with separate public notification for that hearing.

Mr. Hautzinger said this project was previously reviewed by the Design Commission on January 28, 2025. At that time, Staff raised concerns about the design direction for the new Bathhouse building, and recommended that the new bathhouse building be designed with a more traditional massing to match or complement the existing traditional style Community Building to create a cohesive design theme for Recreation Park. The Design Commission also expressed concerns at that review, with comments that included: incorporating some amount of pitched roof forms should be studied by the petitioner, although the commissioners were not opposed to a more modern aesthetic for the building; concerns about the disjointed massing and the amount of blank brown siding; the proposed design was too busy and overall unresolved; and a better solution for screening the rooftop mechanical equipment was needed.

In response to the feedback from the January 28 review, the petitioner has changed the main body of the building to an all-brick exterior with limestone window sills and limestone banding. The height of the walls has been uniformly raised to screen all of the rooftop mechanical equipment, and the color of the rolling gate has been changed from white to dark bronze.

Mr. Hautzinger said that Staff felt the revised design is an improvement to the original concept, which addresses some of the Design Commission's concerns, but Staff still feels that this is a missed opportunity to create a more cohesive design theme for Recreation Park. As is the case with the existing Bathhouse building, the proposed new building is starkly mismatched with the existing Community Building. Since the last meeting, Staff encouraged the petitioner to consider a "Transitional" style for the Bathhouse design, combining a more traditional pitched roof massing with distinctively modern detailing. Staff felt that a "Transitional" design approach could strike an ideal balance between complementing the existing historic Rec Park buildings, while still providing a modern aesthetic for 2025.

Mr. Hautzinger said that if the commissioners do not object to the updated flat roof design concept submitted by the petitioner for review tonight, then Staff would recommend the following items be evaluated:

Front (East) Elevation:

- a. **Service Doors.** The front elevation has numerous service doors which are shown as a soft red color presumably to blend in with the brick wall. However, this emphasizes the appearance of this being a service area or loading dock. Since this is the front of the building, despite being service doors, Staff recommends that the doors and windows be

high quality and more decorative with a Dark Bronze finish to match all of the other doors and windows on the building.

- b. Rolling Gate. The rolling gate looks better in a dark bronze color than the previous white color, but a large rolling gate on the front of the building still has an overall poor appearance, and Staff still recommends that other more decorative gate options be explored.
- c. Decorative Light Fixtures. The only light fixtures shown on the front elevation appear to be wall pack style fixtures at the service doors. It is recommended that all exterior light fixtures be a more decorative style to add design interest to the building. Additionally, it is recommended to add more decorative light fixtures on the front elevation to enhance the building appearance.
- d. Landscaping. Although not under the Design Commission's purview, the petitioner should plan for as much landscaping as possible to screen and soften the large brick wall.

Back (West) Elevation. In contrast to the beautiful view of the existing Community Building from the pool area, the proposed bathhouse building lacks detail and interest.

- a. Windows and Doors. The large brick wall is mostly blank with minimal windows and doors. The overall composition lacks rhythm. Doors and windows are located on the façade based on the floor plan, and the random appearance does not complement the balanced appearance on the existing Community Building. False windows could be added to help balance the façade.
- b. Locker Room Entrance. The entrance to the Locker Rooms could be highlighted with a boxed bum-pout including limestone trim and decorative light fixtures.
- c. Decorative Light Fixtures. As noted on the front elevation, the wall pack light fixtures should be replaced with decorative light fixtures.

In regards to the Community Building renovation and addition, **Mr. Hautzinger** summarized the comments given at the review on January 28, 2025. In response to that feedback, the petitioner has made the following changes to the design:

- Vestibule and Elevator Addition - The profile of the roof eave was not changed, but a small jog was added where it meets the existing building wall.
- Raised Deck - No changes.
- Roof top Mechanical Screen - The screening material has been changed from corrugated metal to smooth plastic panels.

Mr. Hautzinger said the Design Commission should re-evaluate the details of both the Community building and the Bathhouse design to determine if acceptable.

Maryfran Leno, President of the AH Park District Board of Commissioners, gave background information regarding the project. The Board has talked about doing something at Rec Park for the last 15 years, with a referendum about 14 years ago that originally included doing something with the WPA building, and that plan for the last 12 to 13 years was to turn the WPA building back into the Bathhouse, and to knock down the Bathhouse and not have a secondary building. Instead, years later the Arlington Ridge Center project was completed to allow recreation programming to be moved there. This current project was started a couple of years ago, with numerous meetings held with the public, and their intention up until August 2024, was that the WPA building would become the Bathhouse, and the original Bathhouse would be knocked down. When drawings were presented last August, a lot of residents attended and loudly expressed their preference to keep the WPA building a community center. As a result, the Board decided to take a pause, and asked their architects to re-evaluate the design and advise of the cost needed to build a new Bathhouse and complete what needed to be done at the WPA building. In September 2024, the Park District presented the Board with plans that renovated the WPA building and built a new Bathhouse, and at that meeting, the

Board unanimously decided to go from a \$17M budget to a \$24M budget. Numerous meetings have been held since then showing the transition of the Bathhouse design, and the budget increased slightly to \$24.9M.

Ms. Leno said that all of the Park District Board members are here tonight because they feel it is important to be here to tell their story. The Park District held a meeting after the last Design Commission meeting to review the commissioners' comments, and Mr. Kramer presented the original Bathhouse design concept as well as 5 more options, knowing that all of those options would increase the budget again. Many residents were at that meeting and there was discussion about raising the parapet as suggested by the commissioners, however, that change carries a cost of a half million dollars, and changing the roofline to match the WPA building has a cost between \$750,000 and \$1M. **Ms. Leno** said they are tapped out on money, they are trying to do what is best for the community and feel they have been great stewards on what they are bringing forward. They want to make sure the design blends in with the neighborhood, blends in with the entire community, and provide a building that is used for about 100 days a year, except for the classroom that will be used year-round, which is about \$1M. They do not want to take something away from the WPA building, and feel the Bathhouse should be secondary to what the original building is.

Ms. Leno said many residents were in attendance at the last Park District meeting, and they felt the design should not change. The original design and 5 new designs were presented at that meeting, and a poll was taken with the residents to find the most favorable. Unanimously, almost everyone in the audience chose Option #4, which raises the budget to \$25.5M, and goes back to brick and bringing in limestone to compliment the Community building. **Ms. Leno** said that what is being presented tonight is a better design than what was initially presented; it looks timeless, it adds a nod and it ties in with that building. Discussion was had with her fellow Board members to determine if there was extra money to do Option #4 at a cost of adding \$600,000 to the budget, and the Board ultimately decided to agree with the Design Commission to raise the parapet to hide the mechanicals, which will increase the budget to \$25.5M; however, they are not able to go forward and add another \$1M to do an additional change to the roof. The revised design was submitted to Staff and the Design Commission for review tonight, and the comments received back from Staff will be reviewed tonight by John and Maggie. **Ms. Leno** concluded that they are here to work with the commissioners, they appreciate everything the commissioners do and their opinions on the project.

John Dzarnowski responded to the comments made by the commissioners at the last review with regards to the Bathhouse building trying too hard and a directive to simplify it, and that screening of the mechanical units should look intentional and part of the building rather than an add-on to the rooftop units. He said the height of the parapet wall has been raised to screen all mechanical units and the mechanical unit over the concession building has been moved into the screened area. The brown siding in the center portion of the building has been replaced with brick, and limestone banding was added to replicate the limestone on the Community building.

Mr. Dzarnowski also responded to the recommendations in the Staff report as follows.

1. The Park District is not interested in pursuing a "Transitional" style for the Bathhouse.
2. Bathhouse – East Elevation
 - a. The doors that are more utilitarian are intended to be a color to match the brick to hide them because they are not a public entry. These doors are a high-quality material and will not be painted. They are not opposed to going with the same dark bronze finish as the other doors, but have concerns about confusing the public on which doors to use.
 - b. A rolling cantilevered gate is proposed and seems to be the most functional,

and will be the signage for the building. They anticipate returning with a sign variation request for this in the future. The challenge with the rolling gate is to make the front of it not look like a picket fence. Because of the high traffic in the front area of the building, they are not able to use a swing gate because it would close off access for people viewing through the admission area when approaching the building. Other options are to have multiple gates in front of the rolling gate.

- c. Decorative exterior light fixtures will be located in the walkway under the canopy for uplighting and downlighting. They are not opposed to making those lights more decorative, but they are trying to downplay the areas that are more utilitarian and not highlight it as something the public will notice and utilize.
 - d. They have a separate landscape plan to be reviewed as part of the Plan Commission review.
3. Bathhouse – West Elevation
- a. They believe what is currently shown is fairly balanced with regards to the size and layout of doors and windows.
 - b. They are not trying to highlight the entrance to the locker rooms. The secondary entrance to the locker rooms is centered between the glass going into the locker room area. A canopy highlights the entry and exit to the water park. This area is anticipated to be used the majority of the time, as most bathers visiting the facility do not use the locker room.
 - c. They are not opposed to changing some or all of the existing wall pack light fixtures, depending on the type of door the lights are highlighting.
4. Community Building
- a. Vestibule and Elevation Addition – With regards to the profile of the roof and eave, they would love to make it shallower, but there is a minimum size structure in there and a minimum size insulation on the roof; the profile is about shallow as possible right now, without stepping the profile, which will look odd. They are still detailing this area, with the possibility of an inch or two that can be taken out of it. They took the suggestion to tie the fascia back slightly for some separation there, instead of the fascia slamming into the building.
 - b. Raised Deck – This was discussed in depth at the Park District Board meeting two weeks ago. The Board really likes the look of the formliner with the stone pattern, and believes they have the ability to reject panels that are not cast correctly, and have them redone. They feel that pre-cast concrete is not a very economical way to go. They expect this wall to be here for 50 years and believe that the joint between the panels of the pre-cast will eventually break down, resulting in material coming through the wall after 10 years.
 - c. Rooftop Mechanical Screen – They have not determined the material yet, other than knowing they want it to be a flat panel. They agree that a corrugated panel would not be a good panel here because it would detract from the railing. They are trying to find a flat material.

Mr. Dzarnowski also commented about the color of the railings and the suggestion to make the railing on top of the wall a bronze color. The existing railings and handrails on the Community Center are black, and the existing chain link fence and ornamental fence around the outside of the facility are also black. They prefer not to change the color of the fencing and want to keep it all black to match the color on the Community building. They understand that signage on the building will come back for a future review.

Chair Kubow asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was response from those in the audience.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jennifer Kim said she is born and raised in Arlington Heights and is raising her family here, and she worked at Rec Park, and her children went to programs and preschool there; you won't find a better neighbor than the Arlington Heights Park District. She said this project has not been hidden from the public, and many people in the room tonight have been part of the process every step of the way. The Park District has created a building that we are very happy with; she wants change and the Park District made those changes and listened every step of the way. More importantly, the Park District is being stewards of their tax dollars; they know it is not unlimited and that there are lots of other things to do in this Park District, and they want to be able to give it all to the community. The Park District is trying to do what this commission has asked, but also what the community wants. She asked the commissioners to approve what is being presented tonight, because as a member of the community, she approves of it.

John Schroeder, a resident who lives across the street from the site, said that he honestly does not mind the existing 1960's Bathhouse building, but he very much does not like the current design being presented. He loves the existing Community building and the traditional/transitional design the Village Staff came up with. The new Bathhouse looks modern, as opposed to timeless like the Community building and Village Hall. The proposed design does not fit in with the other buildings, and the elevator does not fit in with the Community building, although he was okay with that more than the bathhouse. Being good stewards of the community's money; he would argue that he would rather do nothing with the building, than build what it is being shown.

Vivien Menzies, 212 W. Fremont Avenue. She has grown up in Arlington Heights and spent time at Rec Park. She is 100% behind the design as it is right now. Although she does not love the design of the Bathhouse, she felt that trying to mimic or get closer to the design of the Community building will end up looking like a bad copy of it. She preferred something that has its own design. She liked the limestone bands and the change to be consistent with brick versus the other brown material. She is not a big fan of the deck, but felt that concrete is better than something looking like brick that does not match the building. She also supports the black fence. She said the Park District has done a great job and worked so hard and has been so responsive to the community; they increased the budget to do so, and she is very happy with that.

Myles Whitebloom, 203 N. Haddow, lives across the street from the main building at Rec Park. He appreciates everything the Park District has done, including saving the existing building. He understood fiscal responsibilities, but he believed that it was very possible to make the roof pitches match, without mimicking the existing building. He is not a fan of the proposed design whatsoever, but he acknowledged that there were many people at the Park District meeting in support of it. In regards to the proposed design, he suggested wrapping the cantilevered rooflines on both the north and south end, around the entire building, which could save some money by replacing the top 2-feet of brick and limestone with a dark bronze band. Lastly, he said that 100 years ago when the Community Building was built, who knows how much extra money was spent to do it the right way. This is a once in our lifetime chance to do it right.

Terry Loch, 203 N. Belmont Avenue, lives across the street from Rec Park. He grew up in Arlington Heights and swam at Rec Park. He was glad to see that changes are happening with the existing Bathhouse. The Park District Board has done a great job listening to the community and adapting the design to meet their needs, while being very conscious of tax dollars. He liked what he is seeing tonight, obviously it could be better, but there is a budget. He strongly encouraged the Design Commission to review and approve the project.

Gregg Hansen, 304 N. Hadow Avenue. He and his family have lived one block north of Rec Park for 35 years, spending a lot of time there, and everyone recognizes the landmark building that is there. He commented about the community outreach done by the Park District, listening to residents' feedback, making design changes to try to meet the needs and desires of the community. The current design is a really good plan, the existing building will never be able to be replicated without extensive money. He was a little conflicted with all the apprehension with the design, and pointed out the new apartment building located in close proximity to the site that is a completely different design, but in the same visage when at Rec Park. He felt the Park District did a great job of trying to blend the design of the existing Community building, some of the attributes of it, to meet the modern; we are in 2025, not 1930. The Park District continually listened to the community and were willing to up the budget, up to a point, and the design they came up with, their open collaboration working with the community, being good stewards of the community and Arlington Heights, has resulted in this project that he felt is going to be a landmark, not only for the community, but for the Park District and all of Arlington Heights. He hopes the design is approved and the project moves forward.

Tim Gelinas, 743 N. Belmont Avenue, lives in this neighborhood and is also on the Park District Board. He thanked the commissioners for what they do, their time, and for being a part of the community. He said the comments heard tonight are unfortunately the hard part of doing what the Board has to do, because you cannot make everyone happy all the time, but the Board has tried their hardest to do that. They have tried their darndest to make it a reality within the budget that they have, and unfortunately, they are at that limit. He understood that there will be people who will not be happy, and he was willing to take the heat and stand tall and say that they have done everything they can and they have to balance what they can spend and what they can do. This is not the only park that they have, but it is now going to be in his 12 years on Board, the largest single property that they have re-done, and he is very proud of that because they are not asking for more tax money, and there are other parks they have to go do and they have to balance that with what they can do going forward. There is no more money and he wants this project to happen, but if it comes down to the project not going forward, he will get more heat for not doing something than actually doing it. He said they have addressed multiple things the commissioners brought up at the last review, and they have done pretty well through all the other buildings that he has been a part of within the Village.

There was no further public comment.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed that the architects listened to the commissioner's previous comments and came back with quite a different design for the Bathhouse building, and he likes it. He supports that the doors are now painted to match the brick and he agreed that they should not be primary; he liked that the building is a very horizontal design now, with the limestone trim and cap; the single, tall roof says this is the front door, which is working; and he liked that the two end caps are bronze with glass. He agreed that the best solution for the direction of the sliding door is to close off the entrance after hours; however, he asked what the wall looks like when the door closes. **Mr. Dzarnowski** said there is a track along a portion of the wall, but when the gate is fully closed, the track is not visible because the track is only behind the portion of the wall that the gate covers, which **Commissioner Eckhardt** liked. **Commissioner Eckhardt** commented that the signage shown on the Bathhouse building looked too much like advertising, and **Mr. Dzarnowski** said the sign was intended to be clear not white, so the brick behind it can be seen, and the water park can be seen. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also said that he could support the current sign image on the rolling gate; it is subtle and had an art aspect to it that he liked.

With regards to the Community Building addition, **Commissioner Eckhardt** had no comments; he liked it. He liked the coloration, the red brick, the bronze panels, and the clerestory windows; it is elegant and simple, and a great success. He reiterated his previous comments and concerns about choosing a good quality formliner for the raised deck, and finding an installer with experience; this is extremely important. He originally envisioned the retaining wall in red brick, but was okay with the grey being proposed, which will reflect off the water. He added that there will be seams and expansion joints, which require maintenance, and he cautioned the petitioner to be careful with the drainage. He asked about the gate going up the center stairs, and **Mr. Dzarnowski** said the gate is intended for crowd control for the deck; it will either be open or closed. **Commissioner Eckhardt** had no issues with the design direction of the rear elevation of the Community building, although he felt a touch of modern up against the traditional building is okay. He liked all the glass, and the detailing of the fascia. He was disappointed that a landscape plan was not provided for Commissioner Fitzgerald to review tonight. He had no further comments other than he was in favor of the design and would vote in support of it.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said he was not at the previous review of the project, but overall he felt the project looked really nice. He is a firm believer that when an old, wonderful building like this cannot be matched, then the design should go in the opposite direction so it is obvious which part is original and which part is added. He liked the addition to the Community building, although the roof appears a little thick, but he understood the explanation given and suggested adding another tree in the island in front of it; this will take attention away from the building without hiding it. With regards to the Bathhouse, **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said he is struggling with the east (front) facade and with the five utility doors, which he preferred to be a darker color, maybe matching the color of the gate or matching the brown trim. He suggested adding detail above the garage door on the east elevation such as windows or a frame that looks like windows, to tie in with the other doors. He was okay with the rest of the Bathhouse building.

Commissioner Fitzgerald also said he was really struggling with the large retaining wall facing the pool. It seems like it came out of nowhere, and there is nothing else on the property that is the same material. At a minimum, the color of this wall needs to be submitted to Staff for review, and the color should be picked from some of the other stone and limestone color on the existing building; it should not be a brand-new color. Taller shrubs can help hide the wall, and he recommends don't wash the wall which could help it look better with some patina, rather than trying to keep the wall looking perfect. He would be okay with the large wall if the color of the wall is somewhere else in the project and is approved by Staff. In conclusion, **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said it is a really nice project that will be really nice for the community as a whole. The color of the doors on the Bathhouse, the color of the large wall at the pool, and the size of the plantings, are his only concerns.

Commissioner Kingsley appreciated all the work done by the Park District and their architect, especially all the communication with the neighbors. She was glad to see that the existing Community building will remain, and there will be a separate pool building. She was in favor of the current submittal and said that something that looks different than the existing Community building is the way to go because it would very difficult to mimic the existing building.

With regards to the Bathhouse, **Commissioner Kingsley** agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's concerns about the utility doors on the east elevation being painted the same color as the brick. She preferred a bronze color instead. She liked what was submitted for the rolling gate, something decorative and artistic is great. She agreed that exterior light fixtures should not be wall packs, and should be reviewed by Staff to ensure that the source

of the light is appropriate. **Commissioner Kingsley** made the following recommendations with regards to the Bathhouse: address the sun issue on the south facing community room by lowering the roof to be a unified theme with the overhangs on the Community building; and add a bronze overhang at the double entry door at the pool entrance going into the locker rooms.

With regards to the Community building, **Commissioner Kingsley** liked how the vestibule was cut back and that the overhang is as thin as possible. She agreed with the concerns about the large deck wall and how it will look and agreed that the color of it is very important. She was not in favor of grey, but rather a buff limestone color. She felt Staff should review this element for final details.

Commissioner Kingsley felt the color scheme for both buildings should be dark bronze throughout, instead of black, regardless of material differences, including the lights on the building. She was okay with the chain link fence being the only black item, since it is not available in dark bronze, and you can see through it. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked which way the gate on the pool deck will swing, and **Mr. Dzarnowski** said the gate will swing back against the wall. **Commissioner Kingsley** said it was a missed opportunity that the only access between the pool deck and the upper terrace for wheelchairs and strollers is the elevator, and that enclosure at the left end of the Community building that is connected to the terrace and to the brick wall of the building did not have the same materials as the building.

Chair Kubow thanked the residents for attending tonight, and for the Park District's outreach efforts. He said the design being presented tonight is fantastic, and he is in full support of the progression of where it was previously to where it is today. He considered a more traditional approach to the Bathhouse, but felt it just didn't make sense. The way the small space next to the Community building has been designed, is the transition to the modern architecture, and it is well executed. He agreed with the comments that the doors on the east elevation of the Bathhouse should be a dark bronze color, and with the concerns about the retaining wall at the terrace of the Community building. He felt that landscaping could be an easy, cost-effective solution to help screen the large wall. He also said that mechanical screening on the Community building is important and should be reviewed and approved by Staff. He agreed with Commissioner Kingsley's suggestion about the west elevation above the locker room entrance; adding a small overhang to be consistent with the bronze on the north and south elevation, and he agreed that a bronze color instead of black would be more consistent with the general color palette for both buildings. He said the petitioner has done a great job with the project and he is excited to see it move forward.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification about the railing and fence color on the Community building. He said that Staff is considering the deck railing to be part of the building, but the fencing around the pool is considered part of the site and under the purview of the Plan Commission. **Commissioner Kingsley** clarified that her previous comments pertained to the color of the railing around the terrace deck, as well as the railing at the top of the Community building and the railings on the front stairs. **Mr. Dzarnowski** referred to the site plan and clarified that there is a chain link fence around the large pool, and an ornamental fence around the smaller pool, both of which are proposed to be black. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked if the ornamental fence is available in dark bronze, and **Mr. Dzarnowski** was unsure but said the chain link fence is only available in black or green. **Commissioner Kingsley** said wherever the petitioner can do dark bronze they should, and **Commissioner Fitzgerald** agreed.

Commissioner Kingsley reiterated her concerns about the equipment enclosure on the west side of the Community building near the raised deck. **Ms. Krieger** explained that the original

intent for that enclosure was to screen the mechanical units with a screen fencing system in a bronze color, but they are now looking at a fiber cement system, and working with their landscape architect to add shrubs to soften it. Also, there is an existing sewer in that corner that dictated the size of the enclosure. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that given its high visibility from the park, she had concerns about the material being proposed for the enclosure, which is not similar to the materials on the Community building. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said the mechanical enclosure seems like an afterthought with the way it is positioned up against the building; he felt it needed some attention and a clearer explanation of the materials being used. **Ms. Krieger** said that the screening is meant to be similar to a Trex material, dark brown in color, a minimum of 8' high with steel posts; a durable, long-lasting, solid material. **Chair Kubow** said the view of that entire elevation from Belmont Avenue looks dark and brown, which makes sense for a mechanical surround; he had no issue with what is proposed. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt it should be a requirement that details of this enclosure be reviewed by Staff, to minimize the impact of the enclosure.

Commissioner Eckhardt agreed with Commissioners Kingsley & Fitzgerald's suggestion to add a bronze fascia element on the west elevation facing the pool, maybe over the window. **Chair Kubow** said it is an interesting idea as a recommendation.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said if the artificial stone wall butts into the equipment enclosure material, then he did not want to see it be brick because it will make the artificial wall worse. He would rather see the brown Trex material than masonry.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE NEW BATHHOUSE AND THE ADDITION/RENOVATION TO THE COMMUNITY BUILDING AT RECREATION PARK LOCATED AT 500 E. MINER STREET. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE REVISED PLANS RECEIVED 2/14/24, AND THE PELLA RESERVE PRODUCT DATA RECEIVED ON 1/10/25, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE DOORS AND WINDOWS ON THE EAST ELEVATION OF THE BATHHOUSE BE PAINTED BRONZE, OR FINISHED IN A BRONZE COLOR SIMILAR TO THE OTHER DOORS AND WINDOWS ON THE BATHHOUSE.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE EXTERIOR LIGHT FIXTURES ON THE BUILDING BE REVIEWED BY STAFF, TO CONFIRM THAT THE LIGHT SOURCE IS HIDDEN.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE RAILINGS AND FENCING THAT CAN BE DARK BRONZE, BE CHANGED TO A DARK BRONZE COLOR TO MATCH THE REST OF THE DARK BRONZE THROUGHOUT THE PROJECT.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE RAISED DECK TERRACE WALL BE REVIEWED BY STAFF AND THE PETITIONER, FOR A COLOR THAT IS MORE BUFF THAN GREY, SIMILAR TO LIMESTONE ON THE BUILDING, AND DONE WELL WITHOUT BAD SEAMS.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE FINAL ENCLOSURE SIZE, HEIGHT, MATERIAL AND DESIGN OF THE MECHANICAL SCREENINGS, ESPECIALLY THE TWO ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE COMMUNITY BUILDING, BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY STAFF, AND THAT THEY BE MINIMIZE AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE.
6. A REQUIREMENT THAT A LANDSCAPING PLAN BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW, ESPECIALLY AROUND THE TERRACE WALL AND AT THE FRONT ENTRIES OF BOTH BUILDINGS.
7. A RECOMMENDATION TO LOOK AT ADDING AN OVERHANG ON THE WEST ELEVATION OF THE BATHHOUSE AT THE ENTRY TO THE LOCKER ROOMS.
8. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE

CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

9. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Commissioner Kingsley reiterated her comment about possibly lowering the overhang at the bathhouse multi-purpose room to be closer to the windows, and **Mr. Hautzinger** said that Staff would review any changes for substantial compliance with the approved design. He also clarified that the color of the fencing around the pool and around the children's pool are under the purview of the Plan Commission, and enclosure of equipment and trash are items under the purview of the Design Commission, as well as the railing around the deck. Tonight's comments will be included in the Plan Commission review.

**KINGSLEY, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; KUBOW, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

ITEM 3. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

There was none.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:30 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.